arXiv:0903.3614v2 [math.LO] 28 Oct 2009

MAXIMAL FAILURES OF SEQUENCE LOCALITY IN A.E.C. SH932

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We are interested in examples of a.e.c. with amalgamation having some (extreme) behaviour concerning types. Note we deal with $\mathfrak{k}$ being sequence-local, i.e. local for increasing chains of length a regular cardinal. For any cardinal $\theta \geq \aleph_0$ we construct an a.e.c. with amalgamation $\mathfrak{k}$ with L.S.T.$(\mathfrak{k}) = \theta, |\tau_{\mathfrak{K}}| = \theta$ such that $\{\kappa : \kappa$ is a regular cardinal and $\mathfrak{K}$ is not $(2^\kappa, \kappa)$-sequence-local$\}$ is maximal. In fact we have a direct characterization of this class of cardinals: the regular κ such that there is no uniform κ^+-complete ultrafilter. We also prove a similar result to "$(2^\kappa, \kappa)$-compact for types".

0. Introduction

Recall a.e.c. (abstract elementary classes); were introduced in [7]; and their (orbital) types defined in [8], see on them [5], [1]. It has seemed to me obvious that even with $\mathfrak{k}$ having amalgamation, those types in general lack the good properties of the classical types in model theory. E.g. "(λ, κ)-sequence-locality where

Definition 0.1. 1) We say that an a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ is a (λ, κ)-sequence-local (for types) when κ is regular and for every $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$-increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_i : i \leq \kappa \rangle$ of models of cardinality λ and $p, q \in \mathscr{S}(M_\kappa)$ we have $(\forall i < \kappa)(p \restriction M_i = q \restriction M_i) \Rightarrow p = q$. We omit λ when we omit "$\|M_i\| = \lambda$".
2) We say an a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ is (λ, κ)-local when: $\kappa \geq$ LST$(\mathfrak{k})$ and if $M \in \mathfrak{k}_\lambda$ and $p_1, p_2 \in \mathscr{S}(M)$ and $N \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} M \wedge \|N\| \leq \kappa \Rightarrow p_1 \restriction N = p_2 \restriction N$ then $p_1 = p_2$.
3) We may replace λ by $\leq \lambda, < \lambda, [\mu, \lambda]$ with the obvious meaning (and allow λ to be infinity).

Of course, being sure is not a substitute for a proof, some examples were provided by Baldwin-Shelah [2, §2]. There we give an example of the failure of (λ, κ)-sequence-locality for $\mathfrak{k}$-types in ZFC for some λ, κ, actually $\kappa = \aleph_0$. This was done by translating our problems to abelian group problems. While those problems seem reasonable by themselves they may hide our real problem.

Here in §1 we get $\mathfrak{k}$, an a.e.c. with amalgamation with the class $\{\kappa : (< \infty, \kappa)$-sequence-localness fail for $\mathfrak{k}\}$ being maximal; what seems to me a major missing point up to it, see Theorem 1.3. Also we deal with "compactness of types" getting unsatisfactory results - classes without amalgamation; in [2] this was done only in some universes of set theory but with amalgamation; see §2.

We relay on [2] to get that $\mathfrak{k}$ has the JEP and amalgamation.

Question 0.2. Can $\{\kappa : \mathfrak{k}$ is $(< \infty, \kappa)$-local$\}$, e.g. can it be all odd regular alephs? etc?

Date: October 19, 2009.
The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Note that for this the present translation theorem of [2] is not suitable.

1. An a.e.c. with maximal failure of being local

Claim 1.1. *Assume*

$\circledast_1$ (a) $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta \geq \aleph_0$ *or just* $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \geq \aleph_0, \theta \geq \aleph_0$

(b) *there is no uniform* θ^+*-complete ultra-filter* D *on* κ

(c) τ_θ *is a vocabulary of cardinality* θ *consisting of* θ n*-place predicates with each* n.

Then

$\boxplus$ *there are* $I_\alpha, M_{\ell,\alpha}, \pi_{\ell,\alpha}$ *(for* $\ell = 1,2$ *and* $\alpha \leq \kappa$*),* g_α *(for* $\alpha < \kappa$*) satisfying*

- (a) I_α, *a set of cardinality* θ^κ, *is* $\subseteq$*-increasing continuous with* α
- (b) $M_{\ell,\alpha}$, *a* τ_θ*-model of cardinality* $\leq \theta^\kappa$, *is increasing continuous with* α
- (c) $\pi_{\ell,\alpha}$ *is a function from* $M_{\ell,\alpha}$ *onto* I_α, *increasing continuous with* α
- (d) $|\pi^{-1}_{\ell,\alpha}\{t\}| \leq \theta$ *for* $t \in I_\alpha, \alpha \leq \kappa$ *and* $\ell = 1,2$
- (e) *if* $t \in I_{\alpha+1} \backslash I_\alpha$ *then* $\pi^{-1}_{\ell,\alpha}\{t\} \subseteq M_{\ell,\alpha+1} \backslash M_{\ell,\alpha}$
- (f) *for* $\alpha < \kappa, g_\alpha$ *is an isomorphism from* $M_{1,\alpha}$ *onto* $M_{2,\alpha}$ *respecting* $(\pi_{1,2}, \pi_{2,\kappa})$ *which means* $a \in M_{1,\alpha} \Rightarrow \pi_{1,\alpha}(a) = \pi_{2,\alpha}(g_\alpha(a))$
- (g) *for* $\alpha = \kappa$ *there is no isomorphism from* $M_{1,\alpha}$ *onto* $M_{2,\alpha}$ *respecting* $(\pi_{1,\alpha}, \pi_{2,\alpha})$.

Proof. Follows from 1.2 which is just a fuller version adding to τ_θ unary function F_c for $c \in G$. $\square$

Claim 1.2. *Assuming* $\circledast_1$ *of 1.1 we have*

$\boxplus$ *there are* $I_\alpha, M_{\ell,\alpha}, \pi_{\ell,\alpha}$ *(for* $\ell = 1,2, \alpha \leq \kappa$*) and* g_α *(for* $\alpha < \kappa$*) and* G *such that*

- (a) G *is an additive (so abelian) group of cardinality* $\theta^{\aleph_0}$
- (b) I_α *is a set, increasing continuous with* $\alpha, |I_\alpha| = \theta^\kappa$
- (c) $M_{\ell,\alpha}$ *is a* τ^+_θ*-model, increasing continuous with* α, *of cardinality* θ^κ *where* $\tau^+_\theta = \tau_\theta \cup \{F_c : c \in G\}, F_c$ *a unary function symbol*
- (d) $\pi_{\ell,\alpha}$ *is a function from* $M_{\ell,\alpha}$ *onto* I_α *increasing continuous with* α
- (e) $F^{M_{\ell,\alpha}}_c (c \in G)$ *is a permutation of* $M_{\ell,\alpha}$, *increasing continuous with* α
- (f) $\pi_{\ell,\alpha}(a) = \pi_{\ell,\alpha}(F^{M_{\ell,\alpha}}_c(a))$
- (g) $F^{M_{\ell,\alpha}}_{c_1}(F^{M_{\ell,\alpha}}_{c_2}(a)) = F^{M_{\ell,\alpha}}_{c_1+c_1}(a)$
- (h) $\pi_{\ell,\alpha}(a) = \pi_{\ell,\alpha}(b) \Leftrightarrow \bigvee\limits_{c \in G} F^{M_{\ell,\alpha}}_c(a) = b$
- (i) *for* $\alpha < \kappa, f_\alpha$ *is an isomorphism from* $M_{1,\alpha}$ *onto* $M_{2,\alpha}$ *which respects* $(\pi_{1,\alpha}, \pi_{2,\alpha})$ *which means* $a \in M_{1,\alpha} \Rightarrow \pi_{1,\alpha}(a) = \pi_{2,\alpha}(f_\alpha(a))$
- (j) *there is no isomorphism from* $M_{1,\kappa} \restriction \tau_\theta$ *onto* $M_{2,\kappa} \restriction \tau_\theta$ *respecting* $(\pi_{1,\kappa}, \pi_{2,\kappa})$.

Proof. Let

$(*)_0$ $\sigma = \theta^{\aleph_0}$ so $\sigma = \sigma^{\aleph_0}$

$(*)_1$ (a) let $G = ([\sigma]^{<\aleph_0}, \Delta)$, i.e., the family of finite subsets of σ with the operation of symmetric difference. This is an abelian group satisfying $\forall x(x + x = 0)$

(b) let $\langle a_{f,\alpha,u} : f \in {}^\kappa\sigma, \alpha < \kappa, u \in G\rangle$ be a sequence without repetitions

(c) for $\beta \le \kappa$ let $A_\beta = \{a_{f,\alpha,u} : f \in {}^\kappa\sigma, \alpha < 1 + \beta \text{ and } u \in G\}$

(d) for $\beta \le \alpha$ let $I_\beta = ({}^\kappa\sigma) \times (1 + \beta)$

(e) let $\pi_\beta(a_{f,\alpha,u}) = (f, \alpha)$ when $\alpha < 1 + \beta \le \kappa$

(f) for each $\beta < \kappa$ we define a permutation g_β (of order 2) of A_β by $g_\beta(a_{f,\alpha,u}) = a_{f,\alpha,u+_G\{f(\beta)\}}$ hence $a \in A_\beta \Rightarrow \pi_\beta(g_\beta(a)) = \pi_\beta(a)$.

Note that

$(*)_2$ (a) $|G| = \sigma$

(b) $\langle A_\beta : \beta \le \kappa\rangle$ is a $\subseteq$-increasing continuous, each A_β a set of cardinality $\sigma^\kappa = \theta^\kappa$

(c) $\langle I_\beta : \beta \le \kappa\rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing continuous, each I_β of cardinality $\sigma^\kappa = \theta^\kappa$

(d) π_β is a mapping from A_β onto I_β

(e) if $t \in I_\alpha \subseteq I_\beta$ then $\pi_\beta^{-1}\{t\} = \pi_\alpha^{-1}\{t\}$ has cardinality $|G| = \sigma$

(f) if $t \in I_{\alpha+1} \backslash I_\alpha$ then $\pi_{\alpha+1}^{-1}\{t\} \subseteq A_{\alpha+1} \backslash A_\alpha$.

For each $n < \omega$ and $\beta \le \kappa$ we define equivalence relations $E'_{n,\beta}, E_{n,\beta}$ on ${}^n(A_\beta)$:

$(*)_3$ $\bar a E'_{n,\beta} \bar b$ iff $\pi_\beta(\bar a) = \pi_\beta(\bar b)$ where of course $\pi_\beta(\langle a_\ell : \ell < n\rangle) = \langle \pi_\beta(a_\ell) : \ell < n\rangle$

$(*)_4$ $\bar a E_{n,\beta} \bar b$ iff $\bar a E'_{n,\beta} \bar b$ and there are $k < \omega$ and $\bar a_0, \dots, \bar a_k$ such that

(i) $\bar a_\ell \in {}^n(A_\beta)$

(ii) $\bar a = \bar a_0$

(iii) $\bar b = a_k$

(iv) for each $\ell < k$ for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 < \kappa$ we have $g_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(g_{\alpha_1}(\bar a_\ell))$ is well defined and equal to $\bar a_{\ell+1}$ or $g_{\alpha_2}(g_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(\bar a_\ell))$ is well defined and equal to $\bar a_{\ell+1}$ (note:
first the two cases are one as $g_\alpha^{-1} = g_\alpha$;
second g_α does not preserve $\bar a/E_{n,\beta}$!, in fact, $a, g_\alpha(a)$ are never $E_{n,\beta}$ equivalent;
third clearly they are well defined iff $(\forall \ell \le k)[\bar a_\ell \in {}^n(A_{\min\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2\}})]$ because if $\alpha \le \beta$ then g_β maps A_β onto itself).

Note

$(*)_5$ (a) $E'_{n,\beta}, E_{n,\beta}$ are equivalence relations on ${}^n(A_\beta)$

(b) $E_{\beta,n}$ refine $E'_{\beta,n}$

(c) if $n < \omega, \bar a \in {}^n(A_\beta)$ then $\bar a/E'_{n,\beta}$ has at most σ members

(d) if $\alpha < \beta \le \kappa$ then $E'_{n,\beta} \restriction {}^n(A_\alpha) = E'_{n,\alpha}$ and $E_{n,\beta} \restriction {}^n(A_\alpha) = E_{n,\alpha}$ (read $(*)_4(iv)$ carefully!)

(e) if $\alpha < \beta \le \kappa, \bar a \in {}^n(A_\alpha)$ and $\bar b \in \bar a/E'_{n,\beta}$ then $\bar b \in {}^n(A_\alpha)$

(f) if $\bar{a} \in {}^n(A_\beta)$ where $0 < n < \omega$ then $\bar{a}/E'_{n,\beta}$ has exactly σ members (we shall use only its having $\leq 2^\sigma$ members).

Now we choose a vocabulary τ^*_θ of cardinality 2^σ (but see $(*)_{12}$) and for $\alpha \leq \kappa$ we choose a τ^*_θ-model $M_{1,\alpha}$ with universe A_α such that:

$(*)_6$ (a) $M_{1,\alpha}$ increasing with α

(b) assume that $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ are $E'_{n,\alpha}$-equivalent (so $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in {}^n(A_\beta)$ and $\pi_\alpha(\bar{a}) = \pi_\alpha(\bar{b})$; then $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ realize the same quantifier free type in $M_{1,\alpha}$ iff $\bar{a} E_{n,\alpha} \bar{b}$.

(c) for every function $e \in {}^\sigma\sigma$ there is a two-place predicate $R_e \in \tau^*_\theta$ such that
$$R^{M_{1,\alpha}}_e = \{(a_{f_1,\beta_1,u_1}, a_{f_2,\beta_2,u_2}) \in A_\alpha \times A_\alpha : f_1 = e \circ f_2 \text{ and } i \in u_1 \text{ iff } (|\{j \in u_2 : e(j) = i\}| \text{ is odd})\}.$$

[Why is this possible? First as, for each $\alpha < \kappa, g_\alpha$ maps $R^{M_{1,\alpha}}_e$ onto itself.

Why? Assume we are given a pair $(a_{f_1,\beta_1,u_1}, a_{f_2,\beta_2,u_2})$ from $A_\alpha \times A_\alpha$ so $\beta_1, \beta_2 < \alpha$, so

$(*)_1$ $(a_{f_1,\beta_1,u_1}, a_{f_2,\beta_2,u_2}) \in R^{M_{1,\alpha}}_e$ iff $u_2 = \{e(j) : j \in u_2 \text{ and } (\exists^{\text{odd}} \iota \in u_2)(e(\iota) = e(j))$

$(*)_2$ $(g_\alpha(a_{f_1,\beta_1,u_1}), g_\alpha(a_{f_2,\beta_2,u_2})) \in R^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ iff $(a_{f_1,\beta_1,u_1+\{f_1(\alpha)\}}, a_{f_2,\beta_2,u_2+_G\{f_2(\alpha)\}})$ iff $u_1 +_G \{f_1(\alpha)\} = \{e(\iota) : (\exists^{\text{odd}} \iota \in (u_2 +_G f_2(\alpha))(e(\iota) = e(\iota))\}$.

But

$(*)_3$ $f_1(\alpha) = e_2(f_2(\alpha))$.

So together we get equality.

Second, g_α preserves "$\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ are $E_{n,\alpha}$-equivalent", "$\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ are $E'_{n,\alpha}$-equivalent" and their negations. That is, $\bar{a}, g_\alpha(\bar{a})$ are not $E_{n,\alpha}$-equivalent, but as $(\forall \beta)(g_\beta = g^{-1}_\beta), \bar{a}, \bar{b}$ being $E_{n,\alpha}$-equivalent means that there is an even length pass from $\bar{a}$ to $\bar{b}$, in the graph $\{(\bar{c}, g_\beta(c) : \beta \in [\gamma, \kappa) \text{ and } \bar{c} \in {}^n(A_\gamma)\}$ where $\gamma = \min\{\gamma : \bar{a}, \bar{b} \in {}^n(A_\gamma)\}$. Third, no problem in making the $M_{1,\alpha}$'s increasing by $(*)_5(d)$. Fourth, because of $(*)_5$ in particular clause (f) of $(*)_5$.]

$(*)_7$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ let $M_{2,\alpha}$ be the τ_θ-model with universe A_α such that g_α is an isomorphism from $M_{1,\alpha}$ onto $M_{2,\alpha}$.

Now we note

$(*)_8$ for $\alpha < \beta < \kappa, M_{2,\alpha} \subseteq M_{2,\beta}$.

[Why? By the definitions of $M_{1,\gamma}, g_\gamma, E'_{n,\gamma}, E_{n,\gamma}$, in particular, the "first" and "third", i.e. $(*)_5(d)$ in "why $(*)_6$".]

$(*)_9$ let $M_{2,\kappa} := \cup\{M_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa\}$, well defined by $(*)_8$

$(*)_{10}$ let $\pi_{\ell,\beta} = \pi_\beta$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\beta < \kappa$

$(*)_{11}$ except clause (j) the demands in the conclusion of $\boxplus$ of 1.2 holds easily

$(*)_{12}$ it is O.K. to use a vocabulary of cardinality $2^\sigma = 2^{\theta^{\aleph_0}}$.

[Why? As there is a model M of cardinality 2^σ with $|\tau_M| = \theta$ omitting a quantifier free type p such that $M \subset N \wedge M \equiv N \Rightarrow N$ realizes p.]

Note

$(*)_{13}$ if $(a_{f,\alpha,u_1}, a_{f,\alpha,u_2})$ is $E_{2,\alpha}$-equivalent to $(a_{f,\alpha,v_1}, a_{f,\alpha,v_2})$ then $G \models$ "$u_1 - u_2 = v_1 - v_2$".

[Why? By induction on the k from $(*)_4$.]

So to finish we assume toward contradiction

$\boxtimes$ h is an isomorphism from $M_{1,\kappa}$ onto $M_{2,\kappa}$ which respects $(\pi_{1,\alpha}, \pi_{2,\alpha})$ for $\alpha < \kappa$.

So trivially

$\circledast_1$ $h(a_{f,\alpha,u}) \in \{a_{f,\alpha,v} : v \in G\}$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^n(A_\alpha) \Rightarrow h(\bar{a}) \in \bar{a}/E_{n,\alpha} \subseteq \bar{a}/E'_{n,\alpha}$.

[Why? As h respect $(\pi_{1,\kappa}, \pi_{2,\kappa})$ see $(*)_1(e)$ and $(*)_{10}$ clearly $h(\bar{a}) \in \bar{a}/E'_{n,\alpha}$. But h is an isomorphism from $M_{1,\kappa}$ onto $M_{2,\kappa}$ hence by $(*)_6(b)$ we have $h(\bar{a}) \in (\bar{a}/E_{n,\alpha})$.]

$\circledast_2$ for $f \in {}^\kappa\sigma$ and $\alpha < \kappa$ let $u_{f,\alpha} \in G$ be the $u \in G$ such that $h(a_{f,\alpha,\emptyset}) = a_{f,\alpha,u}$

$\circledast_3$ for $f \in {}^\kappa\sigma, \alpha < \kappa$ and $v \in G$ we have $h(a_{f,\alpha,v}) = a_{f,\alpha,v+_G u_{f,\alpha}}$.

[Why? By $\circledast_1$ clearly h maps any finite sequence $\bar{b} \in {}^n(A_{1,\kappa})$ to an $E_{n,\alpha}$-equivalent sequence for each $\alpha < \kappa$. Now apply this to the pair $(a_{f,\alpha,\emptyset}, a_{f,\alpha,u})$ recalling $(*)_{13}$.]

$\circledast_4$ we define a partial order $\leq$ on ${}^\kappa\sigma$ as follows:
$f_1 \leq f_2$ iff there is a function $e \in {}^\sigma\sigma$ witnessing it; which means $f_1 = e \circ f_2$

$\circledast_5$ if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 < \kappa$ and $f_1 \leq f_2$ (are from ${}^\kappa\sigma$) then $|u_{f_1,\alpha_1}| \leq |u_{f_2,\alpha_2}|$.

[Why? This follows from $\circledast_6$ below.]

$\circledast_6$ if $e \in {}^\sigma\sigma, f_2 \in {}^\kappa\theta$ and $f_1 = e \circ f_2 \in {}^\kappa\theta$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 < \kappa$ then
$u_{f_1,\alpha_1} \subseteq \{e(i) : i \in u_{f_2,\alpha_2}\}$.

[Why? Choose $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\alpha > \alpha_1, \alpha > \alpha_2$ so $a_{f_1,\alpha_1,\emptyset}, a_{f_2,\alpha_1,\emptyset} \in M_{\ell,\alpha}$. Recall that h maps $R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ onto $R_e^{M_{2,\alpha}}$ by $\boxtimes$ and $R_e^{M_{2,\alpha}} = R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ because g_α maps $R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ onto itself (see in $(*)_6$ the "why..."). Now see $(*)_6(c)$, i.e. the definition of $R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$, i.e. obviously $(a_{f_1,\alpha_1,\emptyset}, a_{f_2,\alpha_2,\emptyset}) \in R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ so as h is an isomorphism we have $(h(a_{f_1,\alpha_1,\emptyset}), h(a_{f_2,\alpha_2,\emptyset})) \in R_e^{M_{2,\alpha}}$ so by the previous sentence and the definitions of $u_{f_\ell,\alpha_\ell} (\ell = 1, 2)$ in $\circledast_2$ we have $(a_{f_1,\alpha_1}, u_{f_1,\alpha_1}, (a_{f_2,\alpha_2,u_{f_2,\alpha_2}}) \in R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ which by the definitions of $R_e^{M_{1,\alpha}}$ in $\circledast_6(c)$ implies $u_{f_1,\alpha_1} \subseteq \{e(i) : i \in u_{f_2,\alpha_2}\}$ as promised.]

$\circledast_7$ (a) $|u_{f,\alpha_1}| = |u_{f,\alpha_2}|$ for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 < \kappa, f \in {}^\kappa\sigma$
(b) $\mathbf{n}(f) = |u_{f,\alpha}|$ is well defined
(c) if $f_1 \leq f_2$ then $\mathbf{n}(f_1) \leq \mathbf{n}(f_2)$.

[Why? For clause (a) use $\circledast_6$ for $e = \text{id}_\theta$ and $f_1 = f_2 = f$. Clause (b) follows. Clause (c) holds by $\circledast_6(c)$.]

$\circledast_8$ there are $f_* \in {}^\kappa\sigma$ and $\alpha_* < \kappa$ such that:

- (i) if $f_* \leq f \in {}^\kappa\sigma$ and $\alpha < \kappa$ then $|u_{f_*,\alpha_*}| = |u_{f,\alpha}|$
- (ii) moreover if $f_* = e \circ f$ where $e \in {}^\sigma\sigma$ and $f \in {}^\kappa\sigma, \alpha < \kappa$ then $e \restriction u_{f,\alpha}$ is one-to-one from $u_{f,\alpha}$ onto u_{f_*,α_*} so $\mathbf{n}(f_*) = \mathbf{n}(f)$
- (iii) if $\alpha < \kappa, f_* = e_1, f_1, f_1 = e_2, f_2$ then $e_2 \restriction u_{f_2,\alpha}$ is one-to-one onto $u_{f_1,\alpha}$.

[Why? First note that clause (ii), (iii) follows from clause (i). Second, if not then we can find a sequence $\langle (f_n, \alpha_n, e_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ such that

- (α) $\alpha_n < \kappa, f_n \in {}^\kappa\sigma$ for $n < \omega$
- (β) $f_n \leq f_{n+1}$ say $f_n = e_n \circ f_{n+1}$ and $e_n \in {}^\sigma\sigma$
- (γ) $(e_n, f_{n+1}, \alpha_{n+1})$ witness that (f_n, α_n) does not satisfy the demands $(i)+(ii)$ on (f_*, α_*) hence $\mathbf{n}(f_n) < \mathbf{n}(f_{n+1})$.

Let $u_n = u_{f_n,\alpha_n}$ for $n < \omega$. For $n < \omega$ and $i < \sigma$ let $A_{n,i} = \langle \alpha < \kappa : f_n(\alpha) = i \rangle$, so $\langle A_{n,i} : i < \omega \rangle$ is a partition of κ and $\alpha \in A_{n+1,i} \Rightarrow \alpha \in A_{n,e_n(i)}$. So letting $A_\eta = \cap\{A_{n,\eta(n)} : n < \omega\}$ for $\eta \in {}^\omega\sigma$ clearly $\langle A_\eta : \eta \in {}^\sigma\sigma \rangle$ is a partition of κ.

As we have $\sigma = \sigma^{\aleph_0}$ by $(*)_0$, there is a sequence $\langle e^n : n < \omega \rangle$ satisfying $e^n \in {}^\sigma\sigma$ and $f \in {}^\kappa\sigma$ such that $f_n = e^n \circ f$ for each $n < \omega$. So $n < \omega \Rightarrow f_n \leq f$ which by $\circledast_7(c)$ implies $\mathbf{n}(f_n) \leq \mathbf{n}(f)$. As $\langle \mathbf{n}(f_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ is increasing, easily we get a contradiction.]

$\circledast_9$ $\mathbf{n}(f_*) > 0$, i.e. $\alpha < \kappa \Rightarrow u_{f_*,\alpha} \neq \emptyset$.

[Why? If $(\forall f \in {}^\kappa\sigma)(\forall \alpha < \kappa)(u_{f,\alpha} = \emptyset)$ then (by $\circledast_3$) we deduce h is the identity contradiction. Otherwise assume $u_{f,\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ hence as in the proof of $\circledast_8$ there is f' such that $f_* \leq f' \wedge f \leq f'$ so by $\circledast_5$ and $\circledast_8$ we have $0 < |u_{f,\alpha}| \leq |u_{f',\alpha}| = |u_{f_*,\alpha_*}|$.]

$\circledast_{10}$ if $f \in {}^\kappa\sigma, \alpha < \kappa$ and $i \in u_{f,\alpha}$ then $\kappa = \sup\{\beta < \kappa : \alpha < \beta$ and $f(\beta) = i\}$.

[Why? If not, let $\beta(*) < \kappa$ be $> \sup\{\beta < \kappa : \alpha < \beta, f(\beta) = i\}$ and $> \omega$.
Let $Y = \{(a_{f,\alpha,u}, a_{f,\beta(*),u}) : u \in G, i \notin u\}$. Now for every $\beta \in (\beta(*), \kappa)$ the function g_β maps the set Y onto itself hence by the definition of $E_{2,\beta(*)+1}$ it follows that $\bar{a} \in Y \Rightarrow \bar{a}/E_{2,\beta(*)+1} \subseteq Y$ and as h respects $(\pi_{1,\beta(*)+1}, \pi_{1,\beta(*)+1})$ it follows that $h(\bar{a}) \subseteq \bar{a}/E'_{2,\beta(*)+i}$ and so $\kappa > \gamma \geq \beta(*) + 1 \Rightarrow h^{+1}_\gamma(h(\bar{a})) \in \bar{a}/E'_{2,\beta(*)+1}$.

Now for $\bar{a} \in Y$, the pairs $\bar{a}, h(\bar{a})$ realizes the same quantifier free type in $M_{1,\beta(*)+1}, M_{2,\beta(*)+1}$ respectively, hence by the choice of $M_{2,\beta(*)+1}$ the pairs $\bar{a}, g^{-1}_{\beta(*)+2}, h(\bar{a}))$ realize the same quantifier free type in $M_{1,\alpha}$. By $(*)_6(b)$ recalling $g^{-1}_{\beta(*)+1}(h(\bar{a})) \in \bar{a}/E'_{2,\beta(*)+1}$ this implies that $\bar{a}, g^{-1}_{\beta(*)+1}(h(\bar{a}))$ are $E_{2,\beta(*)+1}$-equivalent. By the definition of $E_{2,\beta(*)}, g^{-1}_{\beta(*)+1}(h(\bar{a}))$ belongs to the closure of $\{\bar{a}\}$ under $\{g^{\pm 1}_\gamma : \gamma \in (\beta(*); \kappa)\}$ hence $h(\bar{a})$ belongs. But by an earlier sentence Y is closed under those functions so $h(\bar{a}) \in Y$. Similarly $h^{-1}(\bar{a}) \in Y, h$ maps Y onto itself, recalling $(*)_2$ this implies $i \notin u_{f,\alpha}$.]

Now fix f_*, α_* for the rest of the proof, without loss of generality f_* is onto σ and let $u_{f_*,\alpha_*} = \{i^*_\ell : i < \ell(*)\}$ with $\langle i^*_\ell : \ell < \ell(*) \rangle$ increasing for simplicity. Now for every $f \in {}^\kappa\sigma$ such that $f_* \leq f$ and $\alpha < \kappa$ by $\circledast_8(ii), (iii)$ we know that if

$e \in {}^{\sigma}\sigma \wedge f_* = e \circ f$ then e is a one-to-one mapping from $u_{f,\alpha}$ onto u_{f_*,α_*}; but so $e \restriction u_{f,\alpha}$ is uniquely determined by $(f_*, \alpha_*, f, \alpha)$ so let $i_{f,\alpha,\ell} \in u_{f,\alpha}$ be the unique $i \in u_{f,\alpha}$ such that $e(i) = i^*_\ell$.

Now if $f_* \le f \in {}^{\kappa}\sigma$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 < \kappa$ and $e \in {}^{\sigma}\sigma$ and we choose $e = \mathrm{id}_\sigma$ so necessarily $f \restriction u_{f,\alpha_1} = e \circ f \restriction u_{f,\alpha_2}$, then $e \restriction \mathrm{Rang}(f \restriction u_{f,\alpha_2})$ map u_{f,α_2} onto u_{f,α_1} but e is the identity so we can write u_f instead of $u_{f,\alpha}$ let $i_{f,\ell} = i_{f,\alpha,\ell}$ for $\ell < \ell(*), \alpha < \kappa$.

Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \{A \subseteq \kappa : \text{ for some } f, f_* \le f \text{ and } \alpha < \kappa \text{ we have } f^{-1}\{i_{f,0}\} \backslash \alpha \subseteq A\}$$

$\boxdot_1$ $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \backslash [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$.

[Why? As κ is regular, this means $A \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow A \subseteq \kappa \wedge |A| = \kappa$ which holds by $\circledast_{10}$.]

$\boxdot_2$ $\kappa \in \mathcal{A}$.

[Why? By the definition of $\mathcal{A}$.]

$\boxdot_3$ if $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq \kappa$ then $B \in \kappa$.

[Why? By the definition of $\mathcal{A}$.]

$\boxdot_4$ if $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ then $A =: A_1 \cap A_2$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}$.

[Why? Let (f_ℓ, α_ℓ) be such that $f_* = e_\ell \circ f_\ell$ and $f_\ell \in {}^{\kappa}\sigma, \alpha_\ell < \kappa$ and $f_\ell^{-1}\{i_{f_\ell,0}\} \backslash \alpha_\ell \subseteq A_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Let pr:$\sigma \times \sigma \to \sigma$ be one-to-one and onto and define $f \in {}^{\kappa}\sigma$ by $f(\alpha) = \mathrm{pr}(f_1(\alpha), f_2(\alpha))$. Clearly $f_\ell \le f$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ hence $i_{f,0}$ is well defined and $i_{f,0} = \mathrm{pr}(i_{f_1,0}, i_{f_2,0})$, so we can finish using appropriate Y and $(*)_6$.]

$\boxdot_5$ if $A \subseteq \kappa$ then $A \in \mathcal{A}$ or $\kappa \backslash A \in \mathcal{A}$.

[Why? Define $f \in {}^{\kappa}\sigma$:

$$f(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 2f_*(\alpha) & \text{if } \alpha \in A \\ 2f_*(\alpha) + 1 & \text{if } \alpha \in \kappa \backslash A. \end{cases}$$

Let $i = i_{f,0}$ so by the definition of $\mathcal{A}$ we have $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}$. But if i is even then $f^{-1}\{i\} \subseteq A$ and i is odd then $f^{-1}\{i\} \subseteq \kappa \backslash A$ so by $\boxdot_3$ we are done.]

$\boxdot_6$ $\mathcal{A}$ is a uniform ultrafilter on κ.

[Why? By $\boxdot_1 - \boxdot_5$.]

$\boxdot_7$ $\mathcal{A}$ is σ^+-complete.

[Why? Assume $B_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}$ for $\varepsilon < \sigma$. Define $A_\varepsilon \subseteq \kappa$ for $\varepsilon < \sigma$ as follows $A_{1+\varepsilon} = B_\varepsilon \backslash \bigcup\limits_{\zeta < \varepsilon} B_\zeta$ for $\varepsilon < \sigma$ and $A_0 = \kappa \backslash \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon < \sigma} B_\varepsilon = \kappa \backslash \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon < \sigma} A_{1+\varepsilon}$. Clearly $\langle A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma \rangle$ is a partition of κ, let $f \in {}^{\kappa}\sigma$ be such that $f \restriction A_\varepsilon$ is constantly ε. Let $f' \in {}^{\kappa}\theta$ be such that $f \le f' \wedge f_* \le f'$. Now $(f')^{-1}\{i_{f',0}\} \in \mathcal{A}$ is included in some A'_ε. If $\varepsilon = 0$ this exemplifies $\bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon < \sigma} B_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}$ as required. If $\varepsilon = 1 + \zeta < \sigma$, then $(f')^{-1}\{i_{f',0}\} \subseteq A_\varepsilon = \kappa \backslash B_\varepsilon$, contradiction to $\boxdot_6$ as $B_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}, (f')^{-1}\{i_{f',0}\} \in \mathcal{A}$.]

So by the assumptions of 1.2 we are done. $\square_{1.2}$

Claim 1.3. *For every* θ *there is an* $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}^*_\theta$ *such that*

$\otimes$ (a) $\mathfrak{k}$ *is an a.e.c. with* $\mathrm{LST}(\mathfrak{k}) = \theta, |\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}| = \theta$
(b) $\mathfrak{k}$ *has the amalgamation property*
(c) $\mathfrak{k}$ *admits closure (see below)*
(d) *if* κ *is a regular cardinal and there is no uniform* θ^+*-complete ultrafilter on* κ, *then**:* $\mathfrak{k}$ *is not* $(\leq 2^\kappa, \kappa)$*-sequence-local for types, i.e., we can find an* $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$*-increasing continuous sequence* $\langle M_i : i \leq \kappa \rangle$ *of models and* $p \neq q \in \mathscr{S}_{\mathfrak{k}}(M_\kappa)$ *such that* $i < \kappa \Rightarrow p \restriction M_i = q \restriction M_i$ *and* M_κ *is of cardinality* $\leq 2^\kappa$.

We shall prove 1.3 below. As in [2] the aim of the definition of "admit closures" is to ensure types behave reasonably.

Definition 1.4. We say an a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ admits closure when for every $M \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ and non-empty $A \subseteq M$ there is $B = c\ell_{\mathfrak{k}}(A, M)$ such that: $M \restriction B \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}, M \restriction B \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} M$ and $A \subseteq M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N \wedge M \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N \Rightarrow B \subseteq M_1$; we may use $cl_{\mathfrak{k}}(A, M)$ for $M \restriction c\ell_{\mathfrak{k}}(A, M)$.

Claim 1.5. *Assume* $\mathfrak{k}$ *is an* a.e.c. *admitting closure.* *Then* $\mathrm{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(a_1, M, N_1) = \mathrm{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(a_2, M, N_2)$ *iff letting* $M_\ell = N_\ell \restriction c\ell_{\mathfrak{k}}(M \cup \{a_\ell\})$*, there is an isomorphism from* M_1 *onto* M_2 *over* M *mapping* a_1 *to* a_2*.*

Remark 1.6. In Theorem 1.3 we can many times demand $\|M_\kappa\| = \kappa$, e.g., if $(\exists \lambda)(\kappa = 2^\lambda)$.

Note

Claim 1.7. *1) If* $\mathfrak{k}$ *satisfies clause (a) of 1.3, i.e. is an a.e.c. with LST-number* $\leq \theta$ *and* κ *fails the assumption of clause (d) of 1.3, that is there is a uniform* θ^+*-complete ultrafilter on* κ, *then* *the conclusion of clause (d) of 1.3 fails, that is* $\mathfrak{k}$ *is* κ*-sequence local for types.*
2) If D *is a* θ^+*-complete ultrafilter on* κ *and* $\mathfrak{k}$ *is an a.e.c. with* $\mathrm{LST}(\mathfrak{k}) \leq \theta$ *then* *ultraproducts by* D *preserve "*$M \in \mathfrak{k}$*", "*$M \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N$*", i.e.*

$\boxtimes$ *if* $M_i, N_i (i < \kappa)$ *are* $\tau(\mathfrak{K})$*-models and* $M = \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} M_i/D$ *and* $N = \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} N_i$ *then**:*
(a) $M \in K$ *if* $\{i < \kappa : M_i \in \mathfrak{k}\} \in D$
(b) $M \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N$ *if* $\{i : M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_i\} \in D$.

Proof. Note that if D is θ^+-complete, then it is σ^+-complete (and much more θ'-complete for the first measurable $\theta' > \theta$).
1) So assume

$\boxplus$ (a) $\langle M_i : i \leq \kappa \rangle$ is $\leq_{gk}$-increasing
(b) $M_\kappa = N_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
(c) $p_\ell = \mathbf{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(a_\ell, N_0, N_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
(d) $i < \kappa \Rightarrow p_1 \restriction M_i = p_2 \restriction M_i$.

We shall show $p_1 = p_2$, this is enough.

Without loss of generality

$(*)$ $a_1 = a_2$ call it a

By (e) we have

- $(e)^+$ for each i there is $n_i < \omega$ and $\langle N_{i,m} : n \leq n_i \rangle$ such that
  - (α) $N_{i_0} = N_i$
  - (β) $N_{i,m_i} = N_i$
  - (γ) $a \in N_{i,\ell}$
  - (δ) if $n < n_i$ then $N_{i,2m+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_{i,2m}, N_{i,2m+2}$.

As $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$ without loss of generality $i < \kappa \Rightarrow n_i = n_*$. Let χ be such that $\langle M_i : i \leq \kappa \rangle, \langle \langle N_{i,n} : n \leq n_* \rangle : i < \kappa \rangle$ and $\mathfrak{k}_{\text{LST}(\mathfrak{k})}$ all belongs to $\mathcal{H}(\chi)$. Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the ultrapower $(\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)^\kappa / D$ and $\mathbf{j}$ the canonical embedding of $(\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ into $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathbf{j}_1$ be the Moskolski-Collapse of $\mathfrak{B}$ to a transitive set $\mathcal{H}_i$ and let $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}_1 \circ \mathbf{j}_0$. So $\mathbf{j}$ is an elementary embedding of $(\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ into $(\mathcal{H}, \in)$ and even $\mathbb{L}_{\theta^+,\theta^+}$-elementary one. Without loss of generality $\tau_k \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\theta)$ hence $\mathbf{j}(\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}) = \tau_{\mathfrak{k}}($ hence by part (2), $\mathbf{j}$ preserves "$N \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$", "$N_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_2$".

So $\mathbf{j}(\langle M_i : i \leq \kappa \rangle)$ has the form $\langle M^*_i : i \leq \mathbf{j}(\kappa) \rangle$ but $\mathbf{j}(\kappa) > \kappa_* = \bigcup\limits_{i<\kappa} j(i)$ by the uniformity of D and let $\mathbf{j}(\langle \langle N_{i,n} : n \leq n_* \rangle : i < \kappa \rangle = \big\langle \langle N^*_{i,n} : n \leq n^* \rangle : i < \mathbf{j}(\kappa) \big\rangle$.

So

- (a) $\mathbf{j} \restriction M_{\kappa_*}$ is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$-embedding of M_κ into $M^*_{\kappa_*}$
- (b) $M^*_{\kappa_*} \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N^*_{i,n}$ and $\mathbf{j}(a) \in N^*_{i,n}$
- (c) $N^*_{*,2m+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N^*_{*,2m}, N^*_{*,2m+2}$ for $2m+1 < n_*$
- (d) $\mathbf{j}(a) \in N_{\kappa_*,m}$.

Together we are done.

2) By the representation theorem of a.e.c. [3, §1]. $\square_{1.7}$

Proof. Proof of 1.3

Let $\sigma = \theta^{\aleph_0}$. Let $G = ([\sigma]^{<\aleph_0}, \Delta)$ and let $\langle c_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ list the members of G, let $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \sigma \rangle$ list ${}^\omega\theta$

- $\boxtimes_1$ $B_{\varepsilon,n} \subseteq G$ for $\varepsilon < \theta$ be such that: if $a, b \in G$ then $(\forall \varepsilon < \theta)(\forall n < \omega)(a \in B_{\varepsilon,n} \equiv b \in B_{\varepsilon,n}) \Rightarrow a = b$; moreover, $B_{\varepsilon,n} = \{c_\alpha : \eta_\alpha(n) = \varepsilon\}$.

Let τ have the predicates $G, I, J, H, +, E_1, R_{n,\alpha}(n < \omega, \alpha < \theta), P_\varepsilon(\varepsilon < \theta)$ and function symbols F_1, F_2, π; so $|\tau| = \theta$. We define K as a class of τ-models by

- $\boxtimes_2$ $M \in K$ iff (up to isomorphism):
  - (a) $\langle G^M, I^M, J^M, H^M \rangle$ is a partition of $|M|$
  - (b) $(G^M, +^M)$ is a subgroup of the group $([\sigma]^{<\aleph_0}, \Delta)$, $P^M_{\varepsilon,n} \subseteq G^M$ for $\varepsilon < \theta, \langle p^M_{\varepsilon,n} : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ be a partition of M such that $a \neq b \in G^M \Rightarrow (\exists \varepsilon < \theta)(\exists n < \omega)[a \in P^M_{\varepsilon,n} \wedge b \notin P^M_{\varepsilon,n}]$
  - (c) F_1 is a function from H^M into J^M
  - (d) $E^M_1 = \{(a,b) : F_1(a) = F_1(a)\}$
  - (e) π^M is a function from H^M into I^M
  - (f) $E^M_2 = \{(a,b) : aE^M_2 b \text{ and } \pi^M(a) = \pi^M(b)\}$
  - (g) F^M_2 is a partial two-place function such that:
    - (α) $F^M_2(a,b)$ is well defined iff $b \in G^M, a \in H^M$

- (β) for $a \in H^M, \langle F^M_2(a,b) : b \in G^M \rangle$ list $a/E^M_2 = \{a' \in H^M : \pi^M(a') = \pi^M(a)\}$ with no repetitions
- (γ) if $a \in H^M$ and $b, c \in G$ then $F^M_2(a, b +^M c) = F^M_2(F^M_2(a,b), c)$, on the $+$ see clause (b)
- (δ) $F(a, 0_{G^M}) = a$ for $a \in H^M$
- (ε) for $n < \omega$ and $\gamma < \theta$ the relation $R^M_{n,\gamma}$ is an n-place relation $\subseteq \cup\{{}^n(a/E^M_1) : a \in H^M\}$.

We define $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$ as being a submodel. Easily

$\boxtimes_3$ $\mathfrak{k} = (K, \leq_{\mathfrak{k}})$ is an a.e.c.

For $A \subseteq M \in K$ let

- (a) $c\ell^0_M(A) =$ the subgroup of $(G^M, +^M)$ generated by $(A \cap G^M) \cup \{b :$ for some $a_1 \neq a_2 \in A$ we have $a_1 E^M_2 a_2$ and $F^M_2(a_1, b) = a_2\}$
- (b) $c\ell^1_M(A) = (A \cap I^M) \cup \{\pi^M(a) : a \in A \cap H^M\}$
- (c) $c\ell^2_M(A) = (A \cap J^M) \cup \{F^M_1(a) : a \in A \cap H^M\}$
- (d) $c\ell^3_M(A) = \{a \in H^M :$ for some $b \in c\ell^0_M(A)$ and $a'_1 \in A \cap H^M, a = F^M_2(a_1, b)\}$
- (e) $c\ell(A, M) = c\ell_M(A) = M \restriction (\cup\{c\ell^\ell_M(A) : \ell = 1, 2, 3\})$.

Now this function $c\ell(A, M)$ shows that $\mathfrak{k}$ admits closure (see 1.4) so

$\boxtimes_4$ $\mathfrak{k}$ admits closure and $\mathrm{LST}(\mathfrak{k}) + |\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}| = \theta$.

Assume κ is as in clause (d) of 1.3, we use the $M_{\ell,\alpha} (\ell = 1, 2, \alpha \leq \kappa)$ constructed in 1.1 (and more of their actual construction as stated in 1.2). They are not in the right vocabulary so let $M'_{\ell,\alpha}$ be the following τ-model:

$\boxtimes_5$ (a) elements $G^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}} = G$
$I^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}} = I_\alpha$
$J^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}} = \{t^*_\ell\}, t^*_\ell$ just a new element
$H^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}} = A_{\ell,\alpha}$
(we assume disjointness)

- (b) $(G^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}, +^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}})$ is $G = ([\sigma]^{<\aleph_0}, \Delta)$
  $P^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_\varepsilon \subseteq G^M$ as required in $\boxtimes_1$ not depending on (ℓ, α)
- (c) $F^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_1$ is constantly t^*_ℓ on $H^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}$
- (d) $E^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_1 = \{(a,b) : F^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_1(a) = F^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_1(b)\}$
- (e) $\pi^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}$ is $\pi_{\ell,\alpha}$ (constructed in 1.1, 1.2)
- (f) $E^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_2 = \{(a,b) : a E^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_1 b$ and $\pi^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}(a) = \pi^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}(b)\}$
- (g) $F_2(a_{f,\alpha,u}, b) = a_{f,\alpha,u+_G b}$
  (recall $\{a_{f,\beta,u} : f \in {}^\kappa\sigma, \beta < \alpha, u \in G\}$ list the elements of $M_{\ell,\alpha}$)
- (h) $R^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}}_{\gamma,n}$ for $n < \omega, \gamma < \sigma$ list the relations of $M_{\ell,\alpha}$ with the function symbols being translated to relations.

Let $M'_{0,\alpha} = M'_{\ell,\alpha} \restriction (G^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}} \cup I^{M'_{\ell,\alpha}})$ for $\ell = 1,2$ and $\alpha \le \kappa$ (we get the same result).

Note easily

$\boxtimes_6$ $M_{0,\alpha} \le_{\mathfrak{k}} M_{\ell,\alpha}, \langle M_{\ell,\alpha} : \alpha \le \kappa\rangle$ is $\le_{\mathfrak{k}}$-increasing (check)

$\boxtimes_7$ $\mathrm{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(t^*_1, M'_{0,\alpha}, M'_{1,\alpha}) = \mathrm{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(t^*_2, M'_{0,\alpha}, M'_{2,\alpha})$ for $\alpha < \kappa$.

[Why? By the isomorphism from $M_{1,\alpha}$ onto $M_{2,\alpha}$ respecting $(\pi_{1,\alpha}, \pi_{2,\alpha})$ in 1.1.]

$\boxtimes_8$ $\mathrm{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(t^*_1, M'_{0,\kappa}, M'_{1,\kappa}) \ne \mathrm{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(t^*_2, M'_{0,\kappa}, M'_{2,\kappa})$.

[Why? By the non-isomorphism in 1.1; extension will not help.]

Now by the"translation theorem" of [2, §4] we can find $\mathfrak{k}'$ which has all the needed properties, i.e. also the amalgamation and JEP. $\square_{1.3}$

2. Compactness of types in a.e.c.

Baldwin [1] ask "can we in ZFC prove that some a.e.c. has amalgamation, JEP but fail compactness of types". The background is that in [2] we construct one using diamonds.

To me the question is to show this class can be very large (in ZFC).

Here we accomplish both by direct translations of problems of existence of models for theories in $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa^+}$, first in the propositional logic. So whereas in [2] we have an original group G^M, here instead we have a set P^M of propositional "variables" and P^M, set of such sentences (and relations and functions explicating this; so really we use coding but are a little sloppy in stating this obvious translation).

In [2] we have I^M, set of indexes, 0 and H, set of Whitehead cases, H_t for $t \in I^M$, here we have I^M, each $t \in I^N$ representing a theory $P^M_t \subseteq P^M$ and in J^M we give each $t \in I^M$ some models $\mathcal{M}^M_s : P^M \to \{\text{true,false}\}$. This is set up so that amalgamation holds.

Notation 2.1. In this section types are denoted by $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ as p, q are used for propositional variables.

Definition 2.2. 1) We say that an a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ has $(\le \lambda, \kappa)$-compactness (for types) when: if $\langle M_i : i \le \kappa\rangle$ is $\le_{\mathfrak{k}}$-increasing continuous and $i < \kappa \Rightarrow \|M_i\| \le \lambda$ and $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathscr{S}^{<\omega}(M_i)$ for $i < \kappa$ satisfying $i < j < \kappa \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{p}_j \restriction M_i$ then there is $\mathbf{p}_\kappa \in \mathscr{S}^{<\omega}(M_\kappa)$ such that $i < \kappa \Rightarrow p_\kappa \restriction M_i = p_i$.
2) We define "$(= \lambda, \kappa)$-compactness" similarly. Let (λ, κ)-compactness mean $(\le \lambda, \kappa)$-compactness.

Question 2.3. Can we find an a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ with amalgamation and JEP such that $\{\theta : \mathfrak{k}$ have (λ, θ)-compactness of types for every $\lambda\}$ is complicated say:

- (a) not an end segment
- (b) any $\{\theta : \theta$ satisfies $\psi\}, \psi \in \mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa^+}$-(second order).

Definition 2.4. Let $\kappa \ge \aleph_0$, we define $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_\kappa$ as follows:

- (A) the vocabulary $\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}$ consist of $F_i (i \le \kappa), R_\ell (\ell = 1,2), P, \Gamma, I, J, c_i\, (i < \kappa), F_i (i \le \kappa)$, (pedantically see later),

(B) the universe of $M \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ is the disjoint union of (so unary) P^M, Γ^M, I^M, J^M so P, Γ, I, J are unary predicates

(C) (a) P^M a set of propositional variables (i.e. this is how we treat them)

(b) Γ^M is a set of sentences of one of the forms $\varphi = (p), \varphi = (r \equiv p \wedge q), \varphi = (q \equiv \neg p), \varphi = (q \equiv \bigwedge\limits_{i<\kappa} p_i)$, so $p, q, p_i \in P^M$

but in the last case $\{p_i : i < \kappa\} \subseteq \{c^M_i : i < \kappa\}$ (or code this!)

(c) for $i \le \kappa$ the function $F^M_i : \Gamma^M \rightarrow P^M$ are such that for every $i < \kappa$ and $\varphi \in \Gamma^M$ we have:

(α) if $\varphi = (p)$ and $i \le \kappa$ then $F_{1+i}(\varphi) = p, F_0(\varphi) = c_0$

(β) if $(\varphi = r \equiv p \wedge q)$ then $F_i(\varphi)$ is c_i if $i = 0$, is p if $i = 1$ is q if $r = 2$ is r if $r \ge 3$

(γ) if $\varphi = (q \equiv \neg(p))$ then $F_i(\varphi)$ is c_2 if $i = 0$, p if $i = 1$, q if $i \ge 2$

(δ) if $\varphi = (q \equiv \bigwedge\limits_{j<\kappa} p_j)$ then $F_i(\varphi)$ is ${}^c3$ if $i = 0$,

q if $i = 1, p_{2+j}$if $i = j + 1$

(d) I a set of theories, i.e. $R^M_1 \subseteq \Gamma \times I$ and for $t \in I$ let $\Gamma^M_t = \{\psi \in \Gamma^M : \psi R^M_1 t\} \subseteq \Gamma^M$

(e) J is a set of models, i.e. $R^M_2 \subseteq (\Gamma \cup p) \times J$ and for $s \in J$ we have $\mathcal{M}^M_s$ is the model, i.e. function giving truth values to $p \in P^M$, i.e. $\mathcal{M}^M_s(p_i)$ is true if $p_i R^M_2 s$; is false if $\neg p R^M_2 s$ and $(\varphi, s) \in R^M_2$ iff computing the truth value of φ in $\mathcal{M}^M_s$ we get truth

(f) $F^M_\kappa : J^M \rightarrow I^M$ such that $s \in J^M \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}^M_s$ is a model of $\Gamma_{F^M_\kappa(s)}$

(g) $(\forall t \in I^M)(\exists s \in J^M)(F^M_\kappa(s) = t)$

(D) $M \le_{\mathfrak{k}} N$ iff $M \subseteq N$ are $\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}$-models from $K_{\mathfrak{k}}$.

Claim 2.5. *$\mathfrak{k}$ is an a.e.c., $LST(\mathfrak{k}) = \kappa$.*

Proof. Obvious. $\square_{2.5}$

Claim 2.6. *$\mathfrak{k}$ has the JEP.*

Proof. Just like disjoint unions (also of the relations and functions). $\square_{2.6}$

Claim 2.7. *Assume $M_0 \le_{\mathfrak{k}} M_\ell$ for $\ell = 0, 1$ and $|M_0| = P^{M_0} \cup \Gamma^{M_0} = P^{M_\ell} \cup \Gamma^{M_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $a_\ell \in I^{M_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Then $\mathbf{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(a_1, M_0, M_1) = \mathbf{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(a_2, M_0, M_2)$ iff $\Gamma^{M_1}_{a_1} = \Gamma^{M_2}_{a_2}$.*

Proof. The if direction, $\Leftarrow$

Let h be a one to one mapping with domain M_1 such that $h{\restriction}M_0 =$ the identity, $h(a_1) = a_2$ and $h(M_1) \cap M_2 = M_0 \cup \{a_2\}$. Renaming without loss of generality h is the identity. Now define M_3 as $M_1 \cup M_2$, as in 2.6, now $a_1 = a_2$ does not cause trouble because $P^{M_0} = P^{M_\ell}, \Gamma^{M_0} = \Gamma^{M_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

The only if direction, $\Rightarrow$

Obvious. $\square_{2.7}$

Claim 2.8. *Assume λ, θ are such that:*

(a) θ is regular $\le \lambda$ and $\lambda \ge \kappa$

- (b) *$\langle \Gamma_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing continuous sequence of sets propositional sentences in $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\omega}$ such that [Γ_i has a model $\Leftrightarrow i < \theta$]*
- (c) *$|\Gamma_\theta| \leq \lambda$.*

Then $\mathfrak{k}$ fail (λ, θ)-compactness (for types).

Remark 2.9. We may wonder but: for $\theta = \aleph_0$ compactness holds? Yes, but only assuming amalgamation.

Proof. Without loss of generality $|\Gamma_0| = \lambda$. Without loss of generality $\langle p^*_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ are pairwise distinct propositions variables appearing in Γ_0 and each $\psi \in \Gamma_i$ is of the form (p) or $r \equiv p \wedge q$ or $r \equiv \neg p$ or $r \equiv \bigwedge\limits_{i<\kappa} p_i$ where $\{p_i : i < \kappa\} \subseteq \{p^*_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$.

Let P_i be the set of propositional variables appearing in Γ_i without loss of generality $|P_i| = \lambda$.

We choose a model M_i for $i \leq \theta$ such that:

$\boxplus$ (a) $|M_i| = P_i \cup \Gamma_i$
(b) $P^M = P_i$ and $\Gamma^{M_i} = \Gamma_i$
(c) the natural relations and functions.

Let $\mathcal{M}_i : P_i \to \{\text{true false}\}$ be a model of Γ_i.

We define a model $N_i \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$ for $i < \kappa$ (but not for $i = \theta$!)

$\boxtimes$ (a) $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_i$
(b) $P^{N_i} = P^{M_i}$
(c) $\Gamma^{N_i} = \Gamma^{M_i}$
(d) $I^M = \{t_i\}$
(e) $J^M = \{s_i\}$
(f) $F^{N_i}_\kappa(s_i) = t_i$
(g) $R^{N_i}_1 = \Gamma_i \times \{t_i\}$
(h) $R^{N_i}_2$ is chosen such that $\mathcal{M}^{N_i}_{s_i}$ is $\mathcal{M}_i$
(i) $F^{N_i}_i$ $(i < \kappa)$ are defined naturally.

Now

$(*)_1$ $\mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(t_i, M_i, N_i) \in \mathbf{S}^1(M_i)$.

[Why? Trivial.]

$(*)_2$ $i < j < \theta \to \mathbf{p}_i = \mathbf{p}_j \restriction M_j$.

[Why? Let $N_{i,j} = N_j \restriction (M_j \cup \{s_j, t_j\})$.]

Easily $\mathbf{tp}(t_j, M_i, N_{i,j}) \leq p_j$ and $\mathbf{tp}(t_j, M_i, N_{i,j}) = p_i$ by the claim 2.7 above.]

$(*)_3$ there is no $p \in \mathbf{S}^1(M_\theta)$ such that $i < \theta \Rightarrow p \restriction M_i = p_i$.

Why? We prove more:

$(*)_4$ there is no (N, t) such that
(a) $M_\kappa \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N$
(b) $t \in I^N$
(c) $(\forall \varphi \in \Gamma^{M_\kappa})[\varphi R^N_1 t]$.

[Why? As then $\Gamma_\theta = \Gamma^M$ has a model contradiction to an assumption.] $\square_{2.8}$

So e.g.

Conclusion 2.10. If $\theta > \kappa$ is regular with no κ^+-complete uniform ultrafilter on θ and $\lambda = 2^\theta$, then $\mathfrak{k}$ is not (λ, θ)-compact.

Remark 2.11. Recall if D is an ultrafilter on θ then $\min\{\sigma' : D \text{ is not } \sigma'\text{-complete}\}$ is $\aleph_0$ or a measurable cardinality.

Proof. (Well known).

Let M be the model with universe $2^\theta, P_0^M = \theta$ and $R^M \subseteq \theta \times \lambda$ be such that $\{\{\alpha < \lambda : \alpha R^M \beta\} : \beta < \lambda\} = \mathcal{P}(\theta), <^M$ the well ordering of the ordinal on λ the vocabulary has cardinality κ and has elimination of quantifiers and Skolem functions.

Let $\Gamma_i = \mathrm{Th}(M, \beta)_{\beta < \lambda} \cup \{\alpha < c : \alpha < \theta\}$ (c a new individual constant), then $\langle \Gamma_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ is as[1] required in 2.12 below hence 2.8 apply. $\square_{2.10}$

Conclusion 2.12. In Claim 2.8 if $\lambda = \lambda^\kappa$ then we can allow $\langle \Gamma_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ to be a sequence of theories in $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa^+}(\tau), \tau$ any vocabulary of cardinality $\leq \lambda$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can add Skolem functions (each with $\leq \kappa$ places) in particular. So Γ_i becomes universal and adding propositional variables for each quantifier free sentence and writing down the obvious sentences, we get a set of propositional sentences, we get Γ_i as there. $\square_{2.12}$

I think we forgot

Observation 2.13. *If $\lambda \geq \kappa \geq \theta =$ cf(θ) then the condition in 2.8 holds.*

Proof. Just let $\Gamma_0 = \{\bigvee_{i<\theta} \neg p_i\}, \Gamma_i = \Gamma_0 \cup \{p_j : j < i\}$. $\square$

Conclusion 2.14. 1) $\mathbf{C}_\kappa = \{\theta : \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta)$ and for every λ and a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ with $\mathrm{LST}(\mathfrak{k}) \leq \kappa, |\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}| = \kappa$ have (λ, θ)-compactness of type$\}$ is the class $\{\theta : \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) > \kappa$ and there is a uniform κ^+-complete ultrafilter on $\theta\}$.
2) In $\mathbf{C}_\kappa$ we can replace "every λ" by $\lambda = 2^\theta + \kappa$.

Proof. Put together 2.10,2.16. $\square_{2.13}$

Of course, a complimentary result (showing the main claim is best possible) is:

Claim 2.15. *If $\mathfrak{k}'$ is an a.c.c., $\mathrm{LST}(\mathfrak{k}') \leq \kappa$ and on θ there is a uniform κ^+-complete ultrafilter on θ and θ is regular and λ any cardinality then $\mathfrak{k}'$ has (λ, κ)-compactness of types.*

Proof. Write down a set of sentences on $\mathbb{L}_{\kappa^+,\kappa^+}(\tau^+_{\mathfrak{k}})$ expressing the demands.

Let $\langle M_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ be $<_{\mathfrak{k}}$-increasing continuous, $\|M_i\| \leq \lambda, p_i = \mathbf{tp}_{\mathfrak{k}}(a_i, M_i, N_i)$ so $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_i$ such that $i < j < \theta \Rightarrow p_i = p_j \restriction M_i$. Without loss of generality $\|N_i\| \leq \lambda$.

Let $\langle N_{i,j,\ell} : \ell \leq n_{i,j,\ell} \rangle, \pi_{i,1}$ witness $p_i = p_j \restriction M_i$ for $i < j < 0$ (i.e. $M_i \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_{i,j,\ell}$ (without loss of generality $\|N_{i,j,\ell}\| \leq \lambda$), $N_{i,j,0} = N_i, a_i \in N_{i,j,\ell}, \bigwedge\limits_{\ell < n_{i,j,\ell}} (N_{i,j,\ell} \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_{i,j,\ell+1} \vee N_{i,j,\ell+1} \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N_{i,j,\ell}$ and $\pi_{i,j}$ be an isomorphism from N_j onto $N_{i,j,n_{i,j}}$ over M_i mapping a_j to a_i.

Let $\tau^+ = \tau \cup \{F_{\varepsilon,n} : \varepsilon < \kappa, n < \omega\}$, arity$(F_{\varepsilon,n}) = n$. Let $\langle M_i^+ : i \leq \theta \rangle$ be $\subseteq$-increasing, M_i^+ a τ^+-expansion of M_i such that $u \subseteq M_i^+ \Rightarrow M_i \restriction c\ell_{M_i^+}(u) \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} M_i$.

---

[1] or directly as Γ_i has Skolem functions

Similarly $(N^{+,\varepsilon}_{i,j,\ell} : \ell \le n_{i,j,\ell}); \varepsilon = 1, \ell$ such that $N^{+,\varepsilon}_{i,j,\ell}$ is a τ^+-expansion of $N_{i,j,\varepsilon}$ as above such that $(\forall \ell < n_{i,j,\ell})(\exists \varepsilon \in \{1,2\})(N^{+,\varepsilon}_{i,j,\ell} \subset N^{+,\varepsilon}_{i,j,\ell+1} \vee N^{+,\varepsilon}_{i,j,\ell+1} \subseteq N^{+,\varepsilon}_{i,j,\ell})$.

Now write down a translation of the question, "is there p such that ..." $\square_{2.15}$

Claim 2.16. *If D is a uniform κ-complete ultrafilter on $\theta, \langle M_i : i \le \theta\rangle$ is $\le_{\mathfrak{k}}$-increasing continuous, $p_i \in \mathscr{S}^{\alpha}_{\mathfrak{k}}(M_i)$ as witnessed by (N_i, a_i) for $i < \kappa, p_i = p_j \restriction M_i$ for $i < j < \kappa$ as witnessed by $(\pi_i, \langle N_{i,j,\ell} : \ell \le m_{i,j}\rangle$ as in the proof above.*
1) There is $p_\kappa \in \mathbf{S}^\alpha(M_\theta)$ such that $i < \theta \Rightarrow p_\kappa \restriction M_i$.
2) In fact for each $i < \kappa$ let $\mathcal{U}_i \in D$ be such that $i < j \in \mathcal{U}_i \Rightarrow n_{i,j} = n^*_i$. Let $N_{i,\kappa,\ell} = \prod\limits_{j\in\mathcal{U}_i} N_{i,j,\ell}/D$. So $\langle N_{i,\kappa,\ell} : \ell \le n^*_\ell\rangle$ are as above. Let $M = \prod\limits_{i<\kappa} M_i/D, \pi_{i,\kappa} = \prod\limits_{j\in\mathcal{U}_i} \pi_{i,j}/D$, etc.

3. On some stability spectrums of an a.e.c.

Convention 3.1. $\mathfrak{k}$ is an a.e.c. with amalgamation.

Definition 3.2. For $\theta \ge \text{LST}(\mathfrak{k})$. We say $\mathfrak{k}$ is (λ, θ)-stable when $M \in K^{\mathfrak{k}}_\lambda \Rightarrow |\mathbf{S}(M)/E^\theta_M| \le \lambda$ where

$$pE^\theta_M q \Leftrightarrow (\forall N)(N \le_{\mathfrak{k}} M \wedge \|N\| \le \theta \Rightarrow p\restriction N = q\restriction\theta).$$

Theorem 3.3. *Fixing θ the class $\{\lambda : \mathfrak{k}$ is (λ,θ)-stable$\}$; behave as in* [6].

Remark 3.4. See [4] = [5, V,§7] or [9] if not covered.

Definition 3.5. $\kappa_\theta(\mathfrak{k}) :=$ Min$\{\kappa \le \theta^+$: there is no sequence $\langle M_i : i \le \kappa\rangle$ which is $\le_{\mathfrak{k}}$-increasing continuous, $\|M_i\| \le \theta$ and $p \in \mathscr{S}(M_\kappa)$ such that $p\restriction M_{i+1}$ strongly (θ)-split over $M_i\}$.

Claim 3.6. *1) If $\lambda > 2^\theta$ and $\mathfrak{k}$ is not (λ,θ)-stable then for some $\kappa \le \theta^+$ satisfying $\lambda^\kappa > \lambda$ we have $\kappa < \kappa_\theta(\mathfrak{k})$.*
2) If $\lambda > \theta, \lambda^\kappa > \lambda$ then $\kappa < \kappa_\theta(\mathfrak{k})$ then $\mathfrak{k}$ not (λ,θ)-stable.

Conclusion 3.7. $(-,\theta)$-stability spectrum - behave as in [6].

Discussion 3.8. We can look at $\lambda \in [\theta, 2^\theta)$ using splitting rather than strongly splitting.

It seems to me the main question is

Question 3.9. Assume $(\exists\theta \ge \text{LS}(\mathfrak{k})(\kappa_\theta(\mathfrak{k}) > \aleph_0)$.
What can you say on Min$\{\theta : \kappa_\theta(\mathfrak{h}) > \aleph_0, \theta \ge \text{LST}(\mathfrak{k})\}$?

Question 3.10. Assume GCH can we find an a.e.c. $\mathfrak{k}$ such that: $(\forall\theta \ge \text{LST}(\mathfrak{k}))(\kappa_\theta(\mathfrak{k}) = \aleph_0)$ but unstable in every regular $\lambda > \text{LST}(\mathfrak{k})$?

References

[1] John Baldwin. *Categoricity*, volume to appear. 200x.
[2] John Baldwin and Saharon Shelah. Examples of non-locality. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 73:765–782, 2008.
[3] Saharon Shelah. *Abstract elementary classes near* $\aleph_1$. Chapter I. 0705.4137. 0705.4137.
[4] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity and solvability of A.E.C., quite highly. *preprint*. 0808.3023.
[5] Saharon Shelah. *Universal classes*, volume in preparation.
[6] Saharon Shelah. Finite diagrams stable in power. *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 2:69–118, 1970.

[7] Saharon Shelah. Classification of nonelementary classes. II. Abstract elementary classes. In *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 419–497. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T.

[8] Saharon Shelah. Universal classes. In *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 264–418. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T.

[9] Saharon Shelah. On what I do not understand (and have something to say), model theory. *Mathematica Japonica*, 51:329–377, 2000. math.LO/9910158.

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`